

Appl. No. 10/707,804
Amdt. dated November 29, 2005
Reply to Office action of September 08, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Rejection of claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b):

Claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kraft (US 6,424,829).

5

Response:

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations previously found in claim 2 in order to overcome this rejection. Claim 1 now specifies that the filtering rule comprises filtering the message if the telephone number of the calling telephone 10 contains less than a predetermined number of digits. This amendment is fully supported by the specification, and no new matter is added.

Ala-Luuko (6,920,332) teaches the use of a blocking list and Huna et al. (2001/0012286) teach filtering telephone numbers from a specific area code. 15 However, the applicant submits that it would not be obvious to combine the teachings of these two references to filter message if the telephone number of the calling telephone contains less than a predetermined number of digits.

For example, filtering telephone numbers with an area code of "000" would not 20 be the same as filtering telephone numbers with a smaller number of digits. There is a difference between the telephone number 000-001-2345 and the number 12345. Dialing each of these numbers on a telephone will not lead to a connection with the same telephone number. Furthermore, none of the cited prior art references teach the use of null digits. Therefore, there is insufficient teaching in the cited prior art to 25 filter telephone numbers containing less than a predetermined number of digits. None of the references consider the possibility of the telephone numbers having a smaller number of digits, and therefore do not render the amended claim 1 obvious.

Appl. No. 10/707,804
Amdt. dated November 29, 2005
Reply to Office action of September 08, 2005

Reconsideration of claim 1 is therefore respectfully requested.

2. Introduction to new claims 21-24:

5 New claim 21 is based on original claims 1 and 6, and is further amended for clarity. Claim 21 contains the distinguishing limitation of “automatically deleting the message without informing a user of the receiving telephone apparatus before the user reads the message if the message satisfies the filtering rule.”

10 On the other hand, Vermelle (2001/0049279) teaches in paragraphs 44-47 automatically deleting a message after it has been consulted. Vermelle does not teach automatically deleting the message without informing the user before the user has read the message. Therefore, new claim 21 is patentably distinguished from the cited prior art.

15 New claim 22 is based on original claims 1 and 9. Claim 22 specifies that the filtering rule that is applied to received messages is stored on the receiving telephone apparatus. Claim 22 also recites that the receiving telephone automatically deletes a message that matches the filtering rule when the SIM card is full with messages.

20 On the other hand, Soderbacka (WO 99/20062) teaches sending a “deleting message” to a user to delete or replace a message that was previously sent to the user. The deleting message is not a filtering rule stored in the phone. Instead, it is a rule that is received from another phone. Therefore, the prior art combination does not teach all of the claimed limitations since no reference teaches a receiving telephone apparatus that can delete messages according to its own filtering rules when the SIM 25 card is full.

Claims 23 and 24 specify that the deleted message is either the first message or

Appl. No. 10/707,804
Amdt. dated November 2⁹, 2005
Reply to Office action of September 08, 2005

the oldest message that matches the filtering rule. Claims 22-24 are supported in original claims 9 and 10, and no new matter is added.

Acceptance of the new claims 21-24 is respectfully requested.

5

In view of the above statements in favor of patentability, the applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Sincerely yours,

10

Winston Hsu

Date: 11/29/2005

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526
P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.
15 Voice Mail: 302-729-1562
Facsimile: 806-498-6673
e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C.

20 is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan.)